

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 19, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. No new matter has been entered through the above amendments. Claims 1-18 have been examined and are respectfully resubmitted for reconsideration.

Claims 1, 2, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Comroe et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,926,495). The Office Action took the position that *Comroe et al.* failed to disclose mobile terminals but making the existing terminals disclosed be mobile would have been obvious. Claims 3, 6-8, 12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Comroe et al.* in view of *Castillo et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,379,337). Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Comroe et al.* in view of *Castillo et al.* and *Franza* (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,187). Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Comroe et al.* in view of *Castillo et al.* and *Fumarolo et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,204,844). Applicants respectfully assert that the claims, as amended, are allowable over the art of record.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-9 depend, recites a computer aided dispatch system including a master dispatch database having one or more data tables, each data table having one or more entries, each containing information pertaining to the dispatch of services by one or more mobile units. The system also includes a central dispatch

computer system capable of accessing the master dispatch database and one or more mobile terminals, having a processor and a local dispatch database. Whenever a change is made to the master dispatch database by the central dispatch computer system, the change is automatically sent by the central dispatch computer system to the one or more mobile terminals, which in turn each make a substantially similar change to its local dispatch database. The one or more mobile terminals are configured to respond to dispatches by traveling to a dispatched site and the computer aided dispatch system provides real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals.

Claim 10, from which claims 11-18 depend, recites a method of dispatching information pertaining to requests for service from a central dispatch computer system to one or more mobile terminals including accessing and changing, by the central dispatch computer, a master dispatch database including one or more data tables, each data table having one or more entries, each containing information pertaining to the dispatch of services by one or more mobile units. The method includes automatically sending to the one or more mobile terminals change information pertaining to the change in the master dispatch database and changing a local dispatch database associated with each of the one or more mobile terminals based upon received change information. The one or more mobile terminals are configured to respond to dispatches by traveling to a dispatched site and the step of sending the change information includes providing real time status

information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals.

As discussed in the present specification and the claims, the present invention provides real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the mobile units. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art of *Comroe et al.*, *Castillo et al.*, *Franza* and *Fumarolo et al.*, when viewed or when combined, fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of the presently pending claims. Therefore, the prior art fails to provide the critical and unobvious advantages discussed above.

Comroe et al. is directed to a computer aided dispatch system that is used in trunked communication system. A master file node 402, illustrated in Fig. 4, maintains a centralized data base for a dispatch system 400. The master file node maintains a data record for each subscriber unit operating on the trunked system and a back-up file node 404 maintains a duplicate data base in case of failure. The system also has a plurality of dispatcher nodes 406 and a central controller 416 that controls a plurality of trunked repeaters. Communications are made to subscribers in subgroups 420-424.

Claim 1 recites, in part, “wherein the one or more mobile terminals are configured to respond to dispatches by traveling to a dispatched site and the computer aided dispatch system provides real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals” and claim 10 recites, in part, “wherein the one or more mobile terminals are configured to respond to dispatches by traveling to a dispatched site and the step of sending the change information comprises providing real

time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals.”

The “mobile terminals” discussed in *Comroe et al.* receive data through the series of repeaters, but none of the “subscribers” is disclosed as having either a processor or a local dispatch database. The rejection appears to consider the user nodes of the dispatchers to be potentially mobile. The rejection alleges that it would have been obvious to have made use of laptops and thus have mobile units. Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Applicants respectfully assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have implemented computers of the dispatchers as laptops because there is no need for the dispatchers to be mobile. The disclosure of *Comroe et al.* details that the mobile units are mobile and there would be no motivation to make the dispatchers mobile as well. Second, even if the dispatchers computers were somehow made mobile, the dispatchers would still not travel “to a dispatched site,” as required by claims 1 and 10.

Lastly, claims 1 and 10 also detail that the information provided “real time status information regarding calls and mobile unit availability to the one or more mobile terminals.” Thus, even if the dispatchers computers were somehow made mobile, as indicated in the rejection, there would be no need to determine or provide mobile unit availability regarding the dispatchers computers. Also, there is nothing in *Comroe et al.* that would teach or suggest such a change. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 is improper and the rejection should be reconsidered and

withdrawn. Similarly, claims dependent on claims 1 and 10, namely claims 2-9 and 11-18, should be allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as indicated for claims 1 and 10.


Castillo et al. is directed to a method and system for providing emergency call service. *Franza* is directed to an apparatus and method for improved emergency call box. *Fumarolo et al.* is directed to a method and apparatus for dynamically grouping communications units in a communications system. Even if Applicants were to accept that the secondary references teach what has been alleged in the rejection, these secondary references do not cure the deficiencies of *Comroe et al.* discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections of 3-9 and 12-18 are likewise improper by virtue of their dependence on independent claims 1 and 10.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-18 each recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in a combination of *Comroe et al.*, *Castillo et al.*, *Franza* and *Fumarolo et al.* and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin F. Turner", is written over a horizontal line.

Kevin F. Turner
Registration No. 43,437

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KFT:noe